## Case 3:06-cv-02071-VRW Document 81 Filed 12/11/06 Page 1 of 3

1	KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065 (rvannest@kvn.com)		
2	WENDY J. THURM - #163558 (wthurm@kvn.com) BENEDICT Y. HUR - #224018 (bhur@kvn.com)		
3	STEVEN K. YODA - #237739 (syoda@kvn.com) 710 Sansome Street		
4	San Francisco, CA 94111-1704 Telephone: (415) 391-5400		
5	Facsimile: (415) 397-7188		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff, Counter-Defendant, and Counter-Claimant		
7			
8			
9			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN &	Case No. C 06-2071 VRW	
13	STEINER LLP, fka THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP,	Case No. C 00-20/1 VRW	
14	Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant,	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER WITHDRAWING SERVICE OF	
15	V.	THELEN'S COUNTER- COUNTERCLAIMS ON SUSANNAH	
16	<b>v</b> .	MAAS AND WITHDRAWING MAAS'S	
17	FRANÇOIS MARLAND,	MOTION TO DISMISS THELEN'S COUNTER-COUNTERCLAIMS	
18	Defendant and Counter-Claimant.		
19	THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP, fka THELEN REID &		
20	PRIEST LLP,		
21	Counter-Counter-Claimant,		
22	v.		
23	FRANÇOIS MARLAND and SUSANNAH MAAS,		
24	Counter-Counter-Defendants.		
25			
26			
27			
2.8			

1	Counter-Counter-Claimant Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP (formerly		
2	known as Thelen Reid & Priest LLP) ("Thelen") and Counter-Counter-Defendant Susannah		
3	Maas ("Maas") hereby stipulate to the following under Civil Local Rules 7-1(a)(5) and 7-12:		
4	WHEREAS, on September 29, 2006, Thelen filed its Counter-Counterclaims against		
5	Maas (Docket No. 38);		
6	WHEREAS, on October 9, 2006, Maas received via Federal Express a Summons and		
7	Thelen's Counter-Counterclaims (Docket Nos. 43 and 44);		
8	WHEREAS, on November 14, 2006, Maas moved to dismiss Thelen's Counter-		
9	Counterclaims, arguing, <i>inter alia</i> , that Thelen did not properly serve its Counter-Counterclaims		
10	on Maas via the Hague Convention (Docket No. 62);		
11	WHEREAS, on November 27, 2006, Defendant, Counter-Claimant, and Counter-		
12	Counter-Defendant Francois Marland ("Marland") filed and served a Revised Amended Answer		
13	and Counterclaims (Docket No. 72);		
14	WHEREAS, on December 1, 2006, Thelen filed an Answer to Marland's Revised		
15	Amended Counterclaims and Amended Counter-Counterclaims against Marland and Maas		
16	(Docket No. 78);		
17	WHEREAS, Maas's Motion to Dismiss Thelen's original Counter-Counterclaims		
18	currently is set for hearing on January 11, 2007 (Docket No. 62); and		
19	WHEREAS, Maas's Motion to Dismiss (Docket No. 62) is now moot since it seeks to		
20	dismiss Thelen's original Counter-Counterclaims (Docket No. 38), which are no longer		
21	operative.		
22	THEREFORE, the Thelen and Maas hereby stipulate that:		
23	(1) Thelen hereby withdraws service of its original Counter-Counterclaims on Maas		
24	without any admission as to whether that service was legally effective or ineffective; and		
25	(2) Maas hereby withdraws her pending Motion to Dismiss Thelen's original Counter-		
26	Counterclaims (Docket No. 62) without any admission as to whether service of Thelen's original		
27	Counter-Counterclaims was legally effective or ineffective and without any prejudice to re-		
28	raising any of the arguments contained therein in the future; and		
	1		

## Case 3:06-cv-02071-VRW Document 81 Filed 12/11/06 Page 3 of 3

1	(3) The hearing on Maas's Motion to Dismiss Thelen's original Counter-Counterclaims		
2	(Docket No. 62), which currently is scheduled on January 11, 2007 at 2:00 p.m., shall be taken		
3	off calendar.		
4	IT IS SO STIPULATED.		
5	Dated: December 5, 2006 KE	KER & VAN NEST, LLP	
6			
7	By:	/s/ Wendy J. Thurm	
8	Att and	ENDY J. THURM orneys for Plaintiff, Counter-Defendant, I Counter-Counter-Claimant	
10	ST	ELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & EINER LLP, fka THELEN REID & IEST LLP.	
11			
12	Dated: December 5, 2000	YES & HARDY LLP	
13	CA LL	RLSON, CALLADINE & PETERSON P	
14			
15	By:	/s/ Andrew W. Hayes	
16 17	Att	DREW W. HAYES orneys for Counter-Counter-Defendant SANNAH MAAS	
18		ES DISTRICE	
19	DURSHANT TO STUDY A TYON, IT IS SO ODDERVOS TATES DISTRICT CO.		
20	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERSD.  GRANTED		
21	5	<b>4</b>	
22	Dated: December 11, 2006	Judge Vaughn R Walker	
23	Max.		
24		THRV DISTRICT OF CO.	
25		Jorkie	
26			
27			
28			
l	II		